REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, noting that the priority documents have been received, and reviewing the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 30, 2004.

I. Status of Claims

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-10 and 17-31 are pending in the application. This Amendment amends claims 1-10, cancels claims 11-16, adds claims 17-31, and addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner.

The amended claim language finds support in the Specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Objections to the Specification

The Specification was objected to because of informalities in paragraphs [0035] and [0039]. Applicants have amended paragraphs [0035] and [0039] to overcome the outstanding objections and respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections to the Specification.

III. Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sahota et al. ("Sahota"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0056460. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"[A]n invention is anticipated if the same device, including all the claim limitations, is shown in a single prior art reference. Every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim." MPEP § 2131.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections because Sahota does not disclose, suggest, or anticipate each and every feature of the claims. In particular, starting with independent claim 1, the claim recites:

> A method for transmitting a program guide, comprising the steps of:
> converting an *extensible markup language (XML)-based electronic program guide (EPG) into an XML-based EPG document for a user's preferred program guide*; and
> transmitting the XML-based EPG template to a receiver.

Specifically, Applicants submit that, at the least, Sahota fails to anticipate the recited claim feature of converting an XML-based electronic program guide (EPG) into an XML-based EPG template for a user's preferred program guide.

Sahota merely teaches a method and system for acquiring and transforming HTML web pages for display on one or more platforms. The acquired HTML web pages are parsed and converted into an XML file. This is different from an embodiment of the present invention, which converts an *XML-based* document into an *XML-based template* document. Moreover, Sahota is completely silent regarding the recited claim feature of an electronic programming guide (EPG) and a user's preferred program guide.

Therefore, Sahota fails to anticipate "converting an extensible markup language (XML)-based electronic program guide (EPG) into an XML-based EPG template for a user's preferred program guide".

Dependent claims 2 and 3 are distinguished from Sahota at least for the reasons given above by virtue of their dependence on independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

IV. Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by alSafadi et al. ("alSafadi"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088420.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration of the rejection because alSafadi does not disclose, suggest, or anticipate each and every feature of the claim. Applicants submit that, at the least, alSafadi fails to anticipate a storage unit that specifically stores an XML-based EPG template document for a *user's preferred program guide*.

In cited paragraph [0059], alSafadi teaches a typical memory 604 for storing software. alSafadi, however, is completely silent regarding the recited claim feature of specifically storing an XML-based EPG template document for a *user's preferred program guide*.

Moreover, alSafadi merely teaches a technique for configuring different types of content in a standardized manner suitable for efficient processing by different EPGs and different devices. This is different from an embodiment of the present invention

-10-

wherein the storage unit stores an XML EPG template document matching a user's preference based on an existing XML-based EPG.

Therefore, alSafadi fails to anticipate a storage unit that specifically stores an XML-based EPG template document for a user's preferred program guide. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hosada, U.S. Patent No. 7,020,839.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration of the rejection because Hosada does not disclose, suggest, or anticipate each and every feature of the amended claims. In particular, independent claim 8 recites:

> A method of providing an electronic program guide (EPG), the method comprising:
> providing an extensible markup language (XML) based EPG data;
> providing an extensible stylesheet language (XSL) based EPG data;
> providing an extensible path (XPath) for accessing a subordinate node in the XML based EPG data;
> transmitting the XSL based EPG data and the XML based EPG data to a receiver; and
> decoding the XML based EPG data by using the XSL based EPG data to provide an XSL document.

Applicants submit that, at the least, Sahota is silent regarding the amended claim feature of "providing an extensible path (XPath) for accessing a subordinate node in the XML based EPG template".

Dependent claim 9 is distinguished from the cited references for at least the reasons given above by virtue of its dependence on independent claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

V.   Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5, 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over alSafadi, in view of Hosada.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hosada, in view of Bennington et al. ("Bennington"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0168188.

Dependent claims 5-7 and 10 are distinguished from the cited references for at least the reasons given above by virtue of their dependence on independent claims 4 and 8. Moreover, Bennington fails to cure the deficiencies of alSafadi and Hosada regarding the recited claim features discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 5-7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

VI.   New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 17-31. In the prior art, EPG data is transmitted using only an XML document. In embodiments of the present invention, EPG data is transmitted not only as an XML document, but also as an XSL document for a style form of the EPG data. Accordingly, Applicants have added new claims in view of the XML and XSL documents.

VII.   Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul H. Nguyen-Ba
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 60,742

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: January 22, 2007

-13-